

Appln. No. 10/626,388
Amendment dated October 2, 2007
Reply to Office Action mailed August 3, 2007

REMARKS

Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 through 21 remain in this application. No claims have been cancelled. No claims have been withdrawn or added.

Paragraphs 2 through 6

Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 11, 12, and 16-21 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over James et al. (U.S. Patent 7,036,080), in view of the alleged Applicant's Admitted Prior Art.

Claims 3, 8, and 13 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over James et al., in view of the alleged Applicant's Admitted Prior Art, and further in view of Young et al. (U.S. Patent 6,064,909).

Claims 4, 9, and 14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over James et al., in view of the alleged Applicant's Admitted Prior Art, and further in view of Nolting (U.S. Patent 6,718,308).

Claims 5, 10, and 15 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over James et al., in view of the alleged Applicant's Admitted Prior Art, and further in view of Microsoft (*Computer Dictionary*).

Claim 1, particularly as amended, is reproduced below in unmarked fashion for clarity and ease of understanding:

1. A method for activating an object for highlighting during display of a presentation in a window, the object occupying a portion of the presentation displayed in the window, the method comprising the steps of:

- recognizing the speaking of an activation word associated with the object, an activation link being associated with the object;
- invoking the activation link associated with the object when the activation word is recognized;
- taking an activation action associated with the activation link when the activation link is invoked; and

Appln. No. 10/626,388

Amendment dated October 2, 2007

Reply to Office Action mailed August 3, 2007

generating modified display data associated with the presentation when the activation action is taken;
wherein the modified display data includes highlighting of the portion of the window in which the object is displayed in the presentation.

It is conceded in the rejection of the Office Action that "Jones et al. do not disclose the information is presented as a 'presentation' (such as to an audience)". It is then asserted that:

Applicant's Admitted Prior Art discloses that visual presentation systems are widely known and used (see Fig. 1 and page 5, paragraph 14 of the specification).

It is also contended that:

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the method of highlighting objects on a screen disclosed by James et al. to be used in a presentation scenario, because this would allow the information displayed to be conveyed to an audience.

However, it is submitted that one of ordinary skill in the art, considering the entire teaching of the Jones patent would not have found it obvious to modify the Jones system to be implemented on a presentation. More specifically, the system of the Jones patent is directed to the interaction between a user and a Graphical User Interface (GUI) that is typically dominated by interaction by the user with a mouse and a keyboard. See, for example, the problem set forth at col. 1, lines 14 through 24 of Jones, where it is stated that (emphasis added):

Many business applications use GUIs to allow users to interface with the applications for performing a number of operations. Typically, GUIs are mouse- and keyboard-intensive, which can be problematic or even impossible to use for many people, including those with physical disabilities. One type of interface that avoids a mouse or keyboard is a speech interface. A speech interface allows audio input of commands to communicate with applications, and can be used by anyone who wishes to speak to their system, such as mobile users with inadequately-sized keyboards and pointing devices.

Thus, the Jones system is taught as being the solution to the situation of a user, such as a person with a physical disability, that has problems

Appln. No. 10/626,388
Amendment dated October 2, 2007
Reply to Office Action mailed August 3, 2007

operating a mouse or keyboard, and thus would benefit from the use of speech interface. However, it is submitted that one of ordinary skill in the art does not recognize that a presentation, or a presentation program, presents the same problem as a mouse and keyboard are rarely if ever employed during the display of a presentation as required by the claims. Therefore, the problem addressed by Jones does not apply to a presentation, and it is submitted that one of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to apply the Jones system to a presentation system.

Further, Jones cites the problem of determining a desired object when the GUI includes multiple windows that may include similar objects. See, for example, Jones at col. 1, lines 25 through 33:

One of the main challenges for a speech interface is specifying the desired target of an audio input, especially in a GUI where multiple selectable objects such as windows, text fields and icons, can have the same label or name. In these situations, it is important for both the computer system and the user to know the current focus when an audio input is issued, to help the system resolve possible ambiguities and to help the user keep track of what he is doing.

Thus, the Jones system is taught as being as a solution to situations where there are multiple windows or objects having the same name. However, again, it is submitted that one of ordinary skill in the art does not recognize that a presentation, or the display of a presentation from a presentation software, presents the same problem with multiple windows having similarly named objects as one of ordinary skill in the art recognizes that a presentation presents information in one window. Jones further points out the problem in multiple window environments where only one window is searched by the speech interface (see col. 1, lines 56 through 67), and again one of ordinary skill in the art recognizes that the display of presentation does not suffer from the problems presented by multiple windows.

Therefore, the Jones patent thus presents a "solution" that does not apply to "problems" that may arise in a presentation environment, and thus

Appln. No. 10/626,388
Amendment dated October 2, 2007
Reply to Office Action mailed August 3, 2007

one of ordinary skill in the art would not find it obvious to apply the Jones system to a presentation environment.

Also, claim 3 requires that "the activation action includes substitution of the designated portion with another object". Claims 8 and 13 include similar requirements.

It is conceded in the rejection that neither Jones nor the alleged AAPA discloses this feature of the claimed invention. Instead, it is asserted that:

Young et al. disclose a method and apparatus for selecting objects through voice, wherein the activation action includes substitution of the designated portion with another object (Fig. 15, MAKETHAT processing, when text is selected on the screen, the MAKETHAT command replaces the selected text with substitute text, column 21, lines 11-26).

And it is further contended that:

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to further modify the combination of James et al. and Applicant's Admitted Prior Art to substitute the designated portion with another object, because this allows incorrect text to be quickly replaced with correct text, as taught by Young et al. (column 2, lines 20-21).

However, assuming for the purposes of argument only that one of ordinary skill in the art would find the application of the Jones system to the display of a presentation to be "obvious", it is submitted that one of ordinary skill in the art would still not find the "substitution of [a] designated portion" of the presentation display with another object to be an obvious modification of the allegedly obvious combination of the Jones-system with a presentation display. In other words, it is submitted that one of ordinary skill in the art does not recognize the advantage of being able to substitute objects in a presentation without the benefit of the applicant's disclosure. Even the Jones patent does not appear to recognize a benefit from the ability to substitute an object.

Appln. No. 10/626,388
Amendment dated October 2, 2007
Reply to Office Action mailed August 3, 2007

It is also contended in the new rejections of the final Office Action that most of the requirements of claims 1, 7, and 12 are disclosed by the Jones patent. In particular, the rejection refers to the portion of the Jones patent at col. 5, lines 23 through 54, which state (emphasis added):

Client computer 130 also contains a standard speech recognition engine (SR engine) 155, such as a Microsoft.TM. SAPI-compliant SR engine. In one embodiment, extension module 140 contains SR engine 155. SR engine 155 produces a text stream from an audio input using dictionaries or phonetic recognition patterns. In one embodiment, client computer 130 loads or registers the stored voice commands against a standard SR engine 155. SR engine 155 then produces a text stream that matches a registered voice command. Extension module 140 uses the text stream to determine the selected object as enumerated below.

The selectable objects may have actions or functions associated with them that are performed upon their selection, such as the opening or closing of an application, or an action within the screen area. In one embodiment, extension module 140 contains an event handler 160 to enable the performance of an operation related to the speech interface prior to performing the action associated with an object selection. Event handler 160 replaces the function, or action, with an extension module function for performing an operation related to the speech interface. The extension module function is then set to call the previously replaced function upon completion of the operation related to the speech interface. For example, upon selection of a button, extension module 140 could produce highlighting prior to performing the action associated with the button selection. In another embodiment, event handler 160 also enables the performance of an operation related to the speech interface after performing the action associated with an object selection. For instance, upon selection of a button, extension module 140 could adjust screen area priorities after performing the action associated with the button selection.

As noted above, one of the requirements of claim 1 is that "the modified display data includes highlighting of the portion of the window in which the object is displayed in the presentation". It is submitted that the referenced portion of the Jones patent is unclear as to what "produce highlighting" means and thus is unclear whether it is the object that is highlighted or the area in which the object resides.

It is therefore submitted that the allegedly obvious combinations of

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER**OCT 02 2007**

Appln. No. 10/626,388
Amendment dated October 2, 2007
Reply to Office Action mailed August 3, 2007

Jones, the alleged AAPA, Young, Nolting, and the Microsoft Computer Dictionary patent set forth in the rejection of the Office Action, would not lead one skilled in the art to the applicant's invention as required by claims 1, 7 and 12. Further, claims 2 through 6, which depend from claim 1, claims 8 through 11, which depend from claim 7, and claims 13 through 21, which depend from claim 12 also include the requirements discussed above and therefore are also submitted to be in condition for allowance.


Withdrawal of the §102(b) rejection of claims 1 through 21 is therefore respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, early reconsideration and allowance of this application are most courteously solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

WOODS, FULLER, SHULTZ & SMITH P.C.



Date: Oct. 2, 2007

Jeffrey A. Proehl (Reg. No. 35,987)
Customer No. 40,158
P.O. Box 5027
Sioux Falls, SD 57117-5027
(605)336-3890 FAX (605)339-3357